



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,473	10/16/2003	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920030287US1	8873
46296	7590	06/02/2009		
MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 548			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
CARTHAGE, MO 64836-0548				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/687,473

Applicant(s)

BATES ET AL.

Examiner

LAURIE RIES

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-12, 14, 19 and 24-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-12, 14, 19 and 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 11 December 2008, to the Original Application, filed 16 October 2003.
2. Claims 1, 4-12, 14, 19, and 24-33 are pending. Claims 2-3, 13, 15-18, and 20-23 have been cancelled by Applicant. Claims 30-33 have been added by Applicant. Claims 1, 10, 19, and 33 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 19, 24-25, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of (Story (U.S. Publication 2002/0129058 A1) and Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2).

As per independent claim 1, Smith III teaches an apparatus including at least one processor, such as a server (See Smith III, Column 4, lines 50-56).

Smith III also teaches a memory coupled to the at least one processor (See Smith III, Column 9, lines 5-44).

Smith III also teaches a web page residing in the memory, the web page including a plurality of links (See Smith III, Figure 5, showing a web page with at least one link, and Column 9, lines 45-54).

Smith also teaches displaying the plurality of unique links in the web page in a manner that provides a visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link in the web page, such as displaying the portions of the web page referring to hyperlinks according to their number of hits, or frequency of use information, where each link has a separate and unique visual indication of the number of hits for that unique link (See Smith III, Figure 5, elements 152 and 153, and element 156, which is displayed for each of the two sample links presented in Figure 5).

While Smith III teaches editing a web page (See Smith III, Column 3, lines 33-58), Smith III does not teach expressly a web page development environment residing in a memory and executed by a processor.

Story teaches a web page development environment and publishing system residing in a memory and executed by a processor, as shown in Story, Figure 6 (See also Story, Page 2, paragraphs 0010-0014).

Smith III also does not teach expressly a disambiguator that processes the plurality of links, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique.

Toivonen teaches a method for generating descriptive link names including determining whether a link name exists and naming additional links based on the determination, thus disambiguating additional link names to ensure that the names are unique (See Toivonen, Column 19, claim 19, and Column 2, lines 26-59).

Smith III, Story, and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web page development environment of Story with the apparatus of Smith III. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow web developers or designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be repositioned or discarded by the web developer or designer.

At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the disambiguation of link names as taught by Toivonen with the web page development environment of Smith III. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Story and Toivonen with Smith III for the benefit of allowing web developers or designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed, and for the benefit of providing a descriptive name for a link such

that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per dependent claim 4, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Story also teaches processing links prior to publishing a web page (See Story, Figure 11, and Page 2, paragraph 0010).). Smith III, Story, and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the processing of links prior to publishing a web page, as taught by Story, with the apparatus of Smith III, Story, and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that all the links are active, up-to-date, and error-free prior to releasing the web page to users. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Story with Smith III, Story, and Toivonen for the benefit of ensuring that all the links are active, up-to-date, and error-free prior to releasing the web page to users to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

As per dependent claim 5, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Toivonen also teaches uniquely naming each link in the web page (See Toivonen, Column 2, lines 60-67). Smith III, Story, and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the uniquely naming each link in the web page, as taught by Toivonen with the web page development environment of Smith III, Story, and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a descriptive name for a link such

that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Toivonen with Smith III and Story for the benefit of providing a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per dependent claim 7, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Toivonen also teaches copying and renaming a web page for each link that is identical to a first link, and causing the link to point to the renamed web page (See Toivonen, Column 8, lines 14-27). Smith III, Story, and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the copying and renaming a web page for each link that is identical to a first link, and causing the link to point to the renamed web page, as taught by Toivonen, with the web page development environment of Smith III, Story, and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a descriptive name for a link to point to particular information such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Toivonen with Smith III, Story, and Toivonen for the benefit of providing a descriptive name for a link to point to particular information such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified

by the user and not confused with other similarly named links, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

As per dependent claim 9, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Smith III also teaches displaying at least one search term in the web page in a manner that indicates frequency of use for the at least one search term in invoking the web page (See Smith III, Column 5, lines 64-67, Column 6, lines 1-10, and Column 12, lines 10-28).

As per independent claim 19, Smith III teaches a program product including (A) displaying a web page in a manner that provides a visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link in the web page, such as displaying the portions of the web page referring to hyperlinks according to their number of hits, or frequency of use information (See Smith III, Figure 5, elements 152 and 153, and element 156, which is displayed for each of the two sample links presented in Figure 5).

Smith III also teaches (B) recordable media bearing the web page development environment, such as the Internet (See Smith III, Column 1, lines 16-23).

While Smith III teaches editing a web page (See Smith III, Column 3, lines 33-58), Smith III does not teach expressly a web page development environment residing in a memory and executed by a processor.

Story teaches a web page development environment and publishing system residing in a memory and executed by a processor, as shown in Story, Figure 6 (See also Story, Page 2, paragraphs 0010-0014).

Smith III also does not teach expressly a disambiguator that processes a plurality of links in a web page, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique.

Toivonen teaches a method for generating descriptive link names including determining whether a link name exists and naming additional links based on the determination, thus disambiguating additional link names to ensure that the names are unique (See Toivonen, Column 19, claim 19, and Column 2, lines 26-59).

Smith III, Story, and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the web page development environment of Story with the apparatus of Smith III. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow web developers or designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be repositioned or discarded by the web developer or designer.

At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the disambiguation of link names as taught by Toivonen with the web page development environment of Smith III. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Story and Toivonen with Smith III for the benefit of allowing web developers or designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed, and for the benefit of providing a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

As per dependent claim 24, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 24 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 4 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 4.

As per dependent claim 25, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 25 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 5 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 5.

As per dependent claim 27, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 27 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 7 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 7.

As per dependent claim 29, Smith III and Story teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Smith III also teaches displaying at least one search term in the web page in a manner that indicates frequency of use for the at least one search term in

invoking the web page (See Smith III, Column 5, lines 64-67, Column 6, lines 1-10, and Column 12, lines 10-28).

4. Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of (Story (U.S. Publication 2002/0129058 A1) and Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,578,078 B1).

As per dependent claim 6, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Smith III, Story, and Toivonen do not teach expressly creating a redirection page for each link that is identical to a first link. Smith teaches a method for preserving referential integrity within web sites that includes creating a redirection page to redirect a browser to a new location for a document (See Smith, Column 8, lines 60-67, and Column 9, lines 1-22). Smith III, Story, Toivonen, and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the redirection page creation of Smith with the link disambiguation of Smith III, Story, and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to access pages that have been moved from their original locations to new locations while informing the user of a new link that will allow the user to access the

page directly in the future. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Smith III, Story, and Toivonen for the benefit of allowing users to access pages that have been moved from their original locations to new locations while informing the user of a new link that will allow the user to access the page directly in the future to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

As per dependent claim 26, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 26 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 6 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 6.

5. Claims 8 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of (Story (U.S. Publication 2002/0129058 A1) and Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Ronald (U.S. Publication 2003/0038836 A1).

As per dependent claim 8, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Smith III, Story, and Toivonen do not teach expressly an access log residing in the memory, the access log indicating historical frequency of use for each of the plurality of links in the web page. Ronald teaches a web mapping tool that includes a server log indicating the number of hits (i.e. frequency of use) over a

time interval (See Ronald, Page 6, paragraph 0139). Smith III, Story, Toivonen and Ronald are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the server log indicating frequency of use information of Ronald with the method of displaying a web page including frequency of use information of Smith III, Story, and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow web designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users to order forms and other priority web objects, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be repositioned or discarded (See Ronald, Page 6, paragraph 0139). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ronald with Smith III, Story, and Toivonen for the benefit of allowing web designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users to order forms and other priority web objects, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be repositioned or discarded, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

As per dependent claim 28, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 28 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 8 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 8.

6. Claims 10, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2).

As per independent claim 10, Smith III teaches a method for processing and displaying a web page that includes a plurality of links including (B) determining frequency of use information for past accesses of the web page, as shown in Smith III, Figure 5, element 156, showing the number of hits (i.e. past accesses) of a web page (See also Smith III, Column 13, lines 38-51).

Smith III also teaches displaying the plurality of links in the web page according to the frequency of use information in a manner that provides a visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link in the web page, such as displaying the portions of the web page referring to hyperlinks according to their number of hits, or frequency of use information (See Smith III, Figure 5, elements 152 and 153, and element 156, which is displayed for each of the two sample links presented in Figure 5).

Smith III does not teach expressly (A) processing the plurality of links, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique.

Toivonen teaches a method for generating descriptive link names including determining whether a link name exists and naming additional links based on the

determination, thus disambiguating additional link names to ensure that the names are unique (See Toivonen, Column 19, claim 19, and Column 2, lines 26-59).

Smith III and Toivonen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages.

At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the disambiguation of link names as taught by Toivonen with the web page development environment of Smith III. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Toivonen with Smith III for the benefit of providing a descriptive name for a link such that the page to which the link refers may be easily identified by the user and not confused with other similarly named links, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

As per dependent claim 12, Smith III and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Smith III also teaches visually indicating a range of frequency of use, such as the number of hits on a hyperlink included on the web page (See Smith III, Figure 5, element 156).

As per dependent claim 14, Smith III and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Smith III also teaches displaying at least one search term in the web page in a manner that indicates frequency of use for the at least one search

term in invoking the web page (See Smith III, Column 5, lines 64-67, Column 6, lines 1-10, and Column 12, lines 10-28).

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Ronald (U.S. Publication 2003/0038836 A1).

As per dependent claim 11, Smith III and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Smith III and Toivonen do not teach expressly examining frequency of use information for the web page from an access log corresponding to the web page. Ronald teaches a web mapping tool that includes a server log indicating the number of hits (i.e. frequency of use) over a time interval (See Ronald, Page 6, paragraph 0139). Smith III, Toivonen, and Ronald are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the server log indicating frequency of use information of Ronald with the method of displaying a web page including frequency of use information of Smith III and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow web designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users to order forms and other priority web objects, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be

repositioned or discarded (See Ronald, Page 6, paragraph 0139). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ronald with Smith III and Toivonen for the benefit of allowing web designers to identify popular web objects from which they can guide users to order forms and other priority web objects, and to clearly show those web objects which are rarely accessed and may need to be repositioned or discarded, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

8. Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of Story (U.S. Publication 2002/0129058 A1) and Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), as applied to claims 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Horvitz (U.S. Patent 6,182,133 B1).

As per dependent claim 30, Smith III, Toivonen, and Story teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. While Smith III, Toivonen, and Story teach a visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link as described in claim 1, Smith III, Toivonen, and Story do not teach expressly that the visual indication for a selected link comprises change of font size in text corresponding to the selected link. Horvitz teaches that a visual indication between multiple links may include changing a font by size and/or type (See Horvitz, Column 10, lines 14-15). Smith III, Toivonen, Story and Horvitz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the visual indication distinguishing multiple links that includes changing a font size of Horvitz with the visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link of Smith III, Toivonen, and Story. The motivation for doing so would have been to attract attention of the user and/or inform the user of the difference between the links (See Horvitz, Column 10, lines 20-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Horvitz with Smith III, Toivonen, and Story for the benefit of attracting attention of the user and/or inform the user of the difference between the links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

As per dependent claim 32, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Claim 32 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 30 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 30.

9. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2) in view of Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Horvitz (U.S. Patent 6,182,133 B1).

As per dependent claim 31, Smith III, and Toivonen teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. While Smith III and Toivonen teach a visual indication of

frequency of use for each unique link as described in claim 1, Smith III and Toivonen do not teach expressly that the visual indication for a selected link comprises change of font size in text corresponding to the selected link. Horvitz teaches that a visual indication between multiple links may include changing a font by size and/or type (See Horvitz, Column 10, lines 14-15). Smith III, Toivonen, and Horvitz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying web pages. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the visual indication distinguishing multiple links that includes changing a font size of Horvitz with the visual indication of frequency of use for each unique link of Smith III and Toivonen. The motivation for doing so would have been to attract attention of the user and/or inform the user of the difference between the links (See Horvitz, Column 10, lines 20-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Horvitz with Smith III and Toivonen for the benefit of attracting attention of the user and/or inform the user of the difference between the links to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 33 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The closest prior art of record, namely Smith III (U.S. Patent 7,233,950 B2), Story (U.S. Publication 2002/0129058 A1), and Toivonen (U.S. Patent 7,257,598 B2), fail to teach or reasonably suggest the combination of limitations of the claimed invention. For example, Smith III, Story, and Toivonen fail to teach or reasonably suggest a web page development environment displaying text in the published web page in a manner that provides a second visual indication of frequency of use for the at least one search term used in invoking the published web page as indicated in the access log, the second visual indication comprising at least one of: change in font style; change in font size; change in font color; change in background color; change in foreground color; blinking; and addition of an indicator near text in the published web page corresponding to a search term.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-12, 14, 19, and 24-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 11 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With regard to the rejection of claims 1-2, 9, 19-22, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant argues that Toivonen fails to teach or reasonably suggest the disambiguator recited in former claim 3, which is now in claim 1, as amended, because Toivonen fails to teach or reasonably suggest changing existing links. The Office respectfully disagrees. Toivonen teaches determining whether the page title (or other predetermined naming source) occurs at multiple pages within the destination sites, and identifying particular naming sources to be included in the link name depending on the outcome of such determinations (See Toivonen, Column 2, lines 44-49). As such, Toivonen teaches changing link names to differentiate between each of the naming sources identified by naming rules (See Toivonen, Column 2, lines 54-55). It is noted that independent claim 1 does not include the limitation of "changing existing links" (emphasis added), but rather processing "a plurality of links". Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laurie Ries/
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100
1 June 2009